[21st October 1927

(g) & (h) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to question No. 329 put at the meeting of 27th August 1927.

(i) The Government cannot state at present what improvement has been effected. The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to question No. 1211 put at the meeting of 8th February 1926.

Project schemes on the Kistna and Tungabhadra rivers, besides the Kistna and Tungabhadra Reservoir projects.

* 781 Q.—Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether, besides the Kistna and the Tungabhadra Reservoir projects which have been worked out in detail, there are any other rough schemes worked out for storage works on the Kistna and the Tungabhadra rivers ; and

(b) if so, whether the Government will be pleased to state what such schemes are and the scope of each of them as roughly worked out till now ?

A.—The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to question No. 330 put at the meeting of the 27th August 1927.

Memorial from the ryots of the Ongole taluk regarding the Gundlakamma project.

* 782 Q.—Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether memorials have been received by the Government from a large number of villages in the Ongole taluk south of the Gundlakamma river requesting that the Gundlakamma Reservoir project may be reconsidered and taken up now ;

(b) whether the memorialists agreed to pay a water-rate of Rs. 10 per acre and also a betterment fee of Rs. 20 per acre ; and

(c) whether, in view of the famine and water scarcity of the said tract of the country this year, they will be pleased to consider the memorials favourably ?

A.—The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to question No. 331 put at the meeting of August 1927.

Gauging operations in the Gundlakamma river before and after 1916.

* 783 Q.—Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to place on the table the data of the gauging operations of the Gundlakamma river carried on prior to the abandoning of the project in 1916 and later, if any ?

A.—The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to clause (d) of question No. 331 put at the meeting of August 1927.

Villages commanded by the Gundlakamma project.

* 784 Q.—Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to lay on the table a list of villages and the area in each village commanded by the Gundlakamma project ?

21st October 1927]

A.—A copy [a] of the letter from the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, No. 1924/27-C.E.P., dated 30th September 1927, with its enclosures is placed on the table.

Variations in the several estimates of the Gundlakamma project.

*785 *Q.*—Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI: Will the hon. the Law Member and the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that Major Hasted has originally worked out the Gundlakamma project and his scheme was for a reservoir of an area of 90 to 100 square miles and to irrigate 150,000 acres;

(*b*) whether a later estimate in 1901 reduced the scope of the project to 35,000 acres and a net return of $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on the capital outlay;

(*c*) whether it is a fact that latterly Mr. J. P. Davidson was of opinion that 45,000 acres would be irrigated under the project by the stored water being credited with its full duty and ultimately in 1916 the estimate was reduced to 20,000 acres irrigation only and a return of only 1·35 per cent on the capital outlay;

(*d*) what is the cause for all these vast variations; and

(*e*) whether the Government will be pleased to cause the matter to be thoroughly examined?

A.—(*a*) Major Hasted did not work out a detailed scheme—he merely proposed the construction of a reservoir with a spread of 90 to 100 square miles to irrigate about 150,000 acres.

(*b*) Yes—but the net return anticipated was 4·9 per cent, not 6·5.

(*c*) Yes.

(*d*) The yield from the catchment area anticipated in the earlier stages of the project was subsequently found to be too sanguine, and the gaugings from 1912 to 1914 went to show that it would be unsafe to depend on getting more than 5,000 m.c.ft. in the reservoir.

(*e*) The Government have called for some further information from the Chief Engineer, and when it comes, will again consider whether it is desirable to make any further examination of the project.

Exclusion of the Gundlakamma Project scheme from the modified Kistna Reservoir project.

*786 *Q.*—Mr SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state with reference to paragraph 2 of the Government Order abandoning the Gundlakamma project—

(*a*) the reasons for not including this scheme in the modified Kistna Reservoir project in the year 1908; and

(*b*) whether since Government have decided in 1916 to abandon this project, the Government will consider the feasibility of including the Gundlakamma wet scheme in the Kistna Reservoir project now?

A.—(*a*) The modified project was designed expressly to confine the irrigable area to the country north of the Gundlakamma and

[a] Printed as Appendix VI on pages 398–399 infra.